REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-37 remain in the application. Claims 15, 21, 24, 32, and 36 have been amended to correct matters of form and to clarify proper antecedent basis for claim elements. No claims have been added or cancelled.

The amendments to the specification correct typographical errors. The amendment to Table 1 corrects the word "object" in the second row, second column. The Table 4 amendment corrects the acronym "PQDI" in the fourth row, second column. The amendment to Table 9 corrects the word "snapshot" in the second row, second column. Amendments to three paragraphs within the application are also noted.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara et al (USPN 6,199,111) and Ote et al. (USPN 6,199,180).

Embodiments of applicant's present invention are directed to automating control over one or more client machines, such as personal computers, using objects. Objects are software modules that can encapsulate both data and functionality. Automation objects are implemented in a client-server model to provide this control over the client machines from a control module. An example of such a control module is a test program. The control module initiates server objects in a server process. Initiation of an object includes instantiation of the object. (Applicant's disclosure, page 4 lines 11-13. See also page 7 line 24 through page 8 line 8 of the disclosure. See also page 35 lines 3-15.) Instantiation, in the parlance of object-oriented programming, is producing an object from its class template. These server objects are created, initialized, and execute as a result of this instantiation. The control module then instructs the server objects to initiate corresponding client objects on the client machines. This client object initiation is performed through a connection mechanism, such as a computer network.

Hara, cited as prior art by the Examiner, discloses a distributed client-server system. This system connects a client to an arbitrary server using a communication module common to the client and a plurality of servers. The client does not have a dedicated server but instead may access the data of any server, eliminating the need for complete data replication between the servers. Hara teaches the multiplexing of data communications from one or more servers into a communications data stream for a client. Hara does not teach or suggest a server process with

one or more server objects with each object controlled by a control module. Further, Hara does not teach the control module initiating these server objects. Hara does not teach or suggest client objects controlling client machines with each client object initiated over a connection mechanism by a server object. Finally, Hara does not teach or suggest the control module directing the server objects to initiate the client objects.

Ote discloses a service processor board having a processor independent from the computer to which it is connected. The board monitors faults in and controls power to the computer via an agent that can execute instructions on the computer. A remote management computer communicates with each of the service processor board and the computer itself via an asynchronous communications interface. Ote teaches communication with and control of a client from a remote management computer. Ote does not teach or suggest a server process with one or more server objects with each object controlled by a control module. Further, Ote does not teach the control module initiating these server objects. Ote does not teach or suggest client objects controlling client machines with each client object initiated over a connection mechanism by a server object. Finally, Ote does not teach or suggest the control module directing the server objects to initiate the client objects.

Applicants' claim 1 specifically recites "a machine automation control module initiating the machine automation server object in the server process and instructing the machine automation server object to initiate the machine automation client object on the client machine to control operation of the client machine". The above claim portion is directed to a combination of at least three claim elements: (1) a control module initiating a server object; (2) the server object initiating the client object on the client machine to control operation of the client machine; and (3) the server object initiating the client object at the instruction of the control module. Examiner rejects the claim, asserting disclosure by Ote of these three claim elements as a power controller communicating with a power unit and an agent. (Examiner's office action, paragraph 2.) The applicants' respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. Ote does not teach or suggest a control module initiating a server object. Ote does not teach or suggest the server object initiating the client object on the client machine to control operation of the client machine. Nor does Ote teach or suggest the server object initiating the client object at the instruction of the control module. Neither does Hara teach or suggest any of these three elements. Further, neither Hara nor Ote teach or suggest a combination of these three elements. As such, at least three

elements of claim 1 are neither taught nor suggested by the references cited. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowed. Since claims 2-15 depend from claim 1, at least three elements of each of these claims is also neither taught nor suggested by the references cited. Claims 2-15 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art and should be allowed.

Applicants' claim 16 specifically recites "executing a machine automation control module in the server process", "initiating a machine automation server object in the server process, under command of the machine automation control module", and "instructing the machine automation server object to initiate a machine automation client object on the client machine". The above claim portion is directed to a combination of at least three claim elements: (1) executing a control module in a server process, (2) initiating a server object in the same server process; and (3) instructing the server object to initiate a client object on the client machine. Examiner rejects the claim, asserting disclosure by Ote of these three claim elements as a power controller communicating with a power unit and an agent. (Examiner's office action, paragraph 2.) The applicants' respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. Ote does not teach or suggest initiating a server object in the same server process as a control module. Nor does Ote teach or suggest instructing the server object to initiate a client object on the client machine. Neither does Hara teach or suggest either of these two elements. Further, neither Hara nor Ote teach or suggest a combination of these three elements. As such, the combination of at least three elements of claim 16 are neither taught nor suggested by the references cited. Therefore, claim 16 should be allowed. Since claims 17-32 depend from claim 16, at least two elements of each of these claims is also neither taught nor suggested by the references cited. Claims 17-32 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art and should be allowed.

Applicants' claim 33 specifically recites "executing a machine automation control module in the server process", "initiating a machine automation server object in the server process, under command of the machine automation control module", and "instructing the machine automation server object to initiate a machine automation client object on the client machine". The above claim portion is directed to a combination of at least three claim elements: (1) executing a control module in a server process, (2) initiating a server object in the same server process; and (3) instructing the server object to initiate a client object on the client machine. Examiner rejects the claim, asserting disclosure by Ote of these three claim elements as a power controller communicating with a power unit and an agent. (Examiner's office action, paragraph 2.) The

applicants' respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. Ote does not teach or suggest initiating a server object in the same server process as a control module. Nor does Ote teach or suggest instructing the server object to initiate a client object on the client machine. Neither does Hara teach or suggest either of these two elements. Further, neither Hara nor Ote teach or suggest a combination of these three elements. As such, the combination of at least three elements of claim 33 are neither taught nor suggested by the references cited. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 33 should be withdrawn and the claim should be allowed.

Applicants' claim 34 specifically recites "executing a machine automation control module in the server process", "initiating a machine automation server object in the server process, under command of the machine automation control module", and "instructing the machine automation server object to initiate a machine automation client object on the client machine". The above claim portion is directed to a combination of at least three claim elements: (1) executing a control module in a server process, (2) initiating a server object in the same server process; and (3) instructing the server object to initiate a client object on the client machine. Examiner rejects the claim, asserting disclosure by Ote of these three claim elements as a power controller communicating with a power unit and an agent. (Examiner's office action, paragraph 2.) The applicants' respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. Ote does not teach or suggest initiating a server object in the same server process as a control module. Nor does Ote teach or suggest instructing the server object to initiate a client object on the client machine. Neither does Hara teach or suggest either of these two elements. Further, neither Hara nor Ote teach or suggest a combination of these three elements. As such, the combination of at least three elements of claim 34 are neither taught nor suggested by the references cited. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 34 should be withdrawn and claim should be allowed.

Applicants' claim 35 specifically recites "executing a machine automation control module in the server process", "initiating a first machine automation server object in the server process, under command of the machine automation control module", and "instructing the first machine automation server object to initiate a first machine automation client object on the first client machine". The above claim portion is directed to a combination of at least three claim elements: (1) executing a control module in a server process, (2) initiating a server object in the same server process; and (3) instructing the server object to initiate a client object on the client machine. Examiner rejects the claim, asserting disclosure by Ote of these three claim elements

as a power controller communicating with a power unit and an agent. (Examiner's office action, paragraph 2.) The applicants' respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. Ote does not teach or suggest initiating a server object in the same server process as a control module. Nor does Ote teach or suggest instructing the server object to initiate a client object on the client machine. Neither does Hara teach or suggest either of these two elements. Further, neither Hara nor Ote teach or suggest a combination of these three elements. As such, the combination of at least three elements of claim 35 are neither taught nor suggested by the references cited. Therefore, claim 35 should be allowed. Since claims 36 and 37 depend from claim 35, at least two elements of each of these claims is also neither taught nor suggested by the references cited. Claims 36 and 37 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art and should be allowed.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request the application be allowed and pass to issuance as soon as possible. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 15, 2003

Homer L. Knearl, Reg. No. 21,197
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1633